CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER
AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. | PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY P. SHELDON.....WILLIAM A. DREW, EDITOR. | TWO DOLLS. & FIFTY CTS. IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE.

VOL VIII.] GARDINER, ME. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1828. [NEW SERIES, VOL. 2.—No. 6.

INTERESTING SELECTIONS.

[We make this week another extract from Dr. Price's Observations addressed to the citizens of the United States. It will be found to contain many solemn truths and important considerations, which strongly recommend themselves to the candid attention of the American people.]

Of Liberty of Conscience, and Civil Establishments of Religion.

In liberty of conscience I include much more than *toleration*. Jesus Christ has established a perfect equality among his followers. His command is, that they shall assume no jurisdiction over one another, and acknowledge no master besides himself. It is, therefore, presumption in any of them to claim a right to any superiority or pre-eminence over their brethren. Such a claim is implied, whenever any of them pretend to *tolerate* the rest.—Not only all *christians*, but all *men* of all religions ought to be considered by a State as equally entitled to its protection as far as they demean themselves honestly and peaceably. *Toleration* can take place only where there is a civil establishment of a particular mode of religion; that is, where a predominant sect enjoys *exclusive* advantages, and makes the encouragement of its own mode of faith and worship a part of the constitution of the State; but at the same time thinks fit to SUFFER the exercise of other modes of faith & worship. Thanks be to God, the new American States are at present strangers to such establishments. In this respect, as well as many others, they have shewn, in framing their constitutions, a degree of wisdom and liberality which is above all praise.

Civil establishments of formularies of faith and worship are inconsistent with the rights of private judgment—they engender strife—they turn religion into a trade—they shoar up error—they produce hypocrisy and prevarication—they lay an unnatural bias on the human mind and its inquiries, and obstruct the progress of truth. Genuine religion is a concern that lies entirely between God and our own souls. It is incapable of receiving any aid from human laws. It is contaminated as soon as worldly motives and sanctions mix their influence with it. Statesmen should countenance it only by exhibiting in their own example a conscientious regard to it in those forms which are most agreeable to their own judgments, and by encouraging their fellow-citizens in doing the same.—They cannot, as *public men*, give it any other assistance. All besides, that has been called a *public leading* in religion, has done it an essential injury, and produced some of the worst consequences.

The Church Establishment in *England* is one of the mildest sort. But even here what a snare has it been to integrity?—and what a check to free inquiry? What dispositions favorable to despotism has it fostered? What a turn to pride and narrowness and domination has it given the clerical character? What struggles has it produced in its members to accommodate their opinions to the subscriptions and tests which it imposes? What a perversion of learning has, it occasioned to defend obsolete creeds and absurdities? What a burden is it on the consciences of some of its best clergy, who, in consequence of being bound down to a system they do not approve, and having no support except that which they derive from conforming to it, find themselves under the hard necessity of either *prevaricating* or *starving*?—No one doubts but that the English clergy in general could with more truth declare that they *do not*, than that they *do* give their *unfeigned assent to all and every thing* contained in the thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common-Prayer; and yet, with a solemn declaration to this purpose, are they obliged to enter upon an office which above all offices requires those who exercise it to be examples of simplicity and sincerity. Who can help execrating the cause of such an evil?

But what I wish most to urge is the tendency of religious establishments to impede the improvement of the world. They are boundaries prescribed by human folly to human investigation; and inclosures which intercept the light and confine the exertions of reason. Let any one imagine to himself what effects similar establishments would have in philosophy, navigation, metaphysics, medicine or mathematics. Something like this took place in logic and philosophy; while the IPSE DIXIT of Aristotle and the nonsense of the schools maintained an authority like that of the creeds of churchmen: And the effect was a longer continuance of the world in the ignorance and barbarity of the dark ages. But civil establishments of religion are more pernicious. So apt are mankind to misrepresent the character of the Deity, and to connect his favour with particular modes of faith, that it must be expected, that a religion so settled will be what it has hitherto been—a gloomy and cruel superstition bearing the name of religion.

It has been long a subject of dispute, which is worse in its effects on society, *such* a religion or speculative Atheism. For my own part, I could almost give the preference to the latter. ATHEISM is so repugnant to every principle of common sense, that it is not possible it should ever gain much ground, or become very prevalent. On the contrary; there is a particular proneness in the human mind to SUPERSTITION, and nothing is more likely to become prevalent. Atheism leaves us to the full influence of most of our natural feelings and social principles; and these are so strong in their operation, that in general they are a sufficient guard to the order of society. But superstition counteracts these principles, by holding forth men to one another as objects of divine hatred; and by putting them on harrassing, silencing, imprisoning and burning one another in order to do God service. Atheism is a sanctuary for vice by taking away the motives to virtue arising from the will of God and the fear of a future judgment. But Superstition is more a sanctuary for vice, by teaching men ways of pleasing God without moral virtue, and by leading them even to compound for wickedness by *ritual* services, by bodily penances and mortifications, by adorning shrines, going pilgrimages, saying many prayers, receiving absolution from the priest, exterminating heretics, &c. Atheism destroys the sacredness and obligation of an oath. But is there not also a religion (so called) which does this, by teaching that there is a power which can dispense with the obligation of oaths, that *pious* frauds are right, and that faith is not to be kept with heretics?

It is indeed only a rational and liberal religion; a religion founded on just notions of the Deity as a being who regards equally every sincere worshipper, and by whom all are alike favoured as far as they act up to the light they enjoy; a religion which consists in the imitation of the moral perfections of an almighty but benevolent Governor of nature who directs for the best all events, in confidence in the care of his providence, in resignation to his will, and in the faithful discharge of every duty of piety and morality from a regard to his authority and the apprehension of a future righteous retribution. It is only THIS religion (the inspiring principle of every thing fair and worthy and joyful, and which in truth is nothing but the love of God and man and virtue warming the heart and directing the conduct.) It is only this kind of religion that can bless the world, or be an advantage to society. This is the religion that every enlightened friend to mankind will be zealous to promote. But it is a religion that the powers of the world know little of, and which will always be best promoted by being left free and open.

I cannot help adding here, that this is in particular the *Christian* religion. Christianity teaches us that there is none good but one, that is, God; that he willeth all men to be saved, and will punish nothing but wickedness; that he desires mercy and not sacrifice, (benevolence rather than rituals); that loving him with all our hearts, and loving our neighbour as ourselves, is the whole of our duty; and that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him. It rests its authority on the power of God, not of man; refers itself entirely to the understandings of men; makes us the subjects of a kingdom that is not of this world; and requires us to elevate our minds above temporal emoluments, and to look forward to a state beyond the grave, where a government of perfect virtue will be erected under that Messiah who has *tasted death for every man*. What have the powers of the world to do with such a religion? It disclaims all connexion with them; it made its way at first in opposition to them; and, as far as it is now upheld by them, it is dishonored and vilified.

The injury which civil establishments do to Christianity may be learnt from the following considerations.

First. The spirit of religious establishments is opposite to the spirit of christianity. It is a spirit of pride and tyranny in opposition to the christian *lowly* spirit; a contracted and selfish spirit, in opposition to the christian enlarged and benevolent spirit; the spirit of the world in opposition to the christian *heavenly* spirit.

Secondly. Religious establishments are founded on a claim of authority in the christian church which overthrows Christ's authority. He has in the scriptures given his followers a code of laws, to which he requires them to adhere as their *only* guide. But the language of the framers of church establishments is, "We *have authority in controversies of faith and power to decree rites and ceremonies*." We are the deputies of Christ upon earth, who have been commissioned by him to interpret his laws, and to rule his church. You must therefore follow us. The scriptures are insufficient. Our interpretations you must receive as Christ's laws; our creeds as *his* doctrine; our inventions as *his* institutions."

It is evident, as the excellent Hoadly has shewn, that these claims turn Christ out of the government of his own kingdom, and place usurpers on his throne. They are therefore derogatory to his honor; and a submission to them is a breach of the allegiance due to him. They have been almost fatal to true christianity; and attempts to enforce them by civil penalties, have watered the christian world with the blood of saints and martyrs.

Thirdly. The difficulty of introducing alterations into church establishments after they have been once formed, is another objection to them. Hence it happens, that they remain always the same amidst all changes of public manners and opinions; and that a kingdom may go on for ages in idolatrous worship, after a general conviction has taken place, that there is but one object of religious worship, namely, *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. What a sad scene of religious hypocrisy must such a discordance between public conviction and the public forms produce? At this day in some European countries, the absurdities and slavishness of their hierarchies are seen and acknowledged; but being incorporated with the state, it is scarcely possible to get rid of them.

What can be more striking than the state of England in this respect? The system of faith and worship established in it was formed above two hundred years ago, when Europe was just emerging from darkness and barbarity. The times have ever since been growing more enlightened; but without any effect on the establishment. Not a ray of the increasing light has penetrated it. Not one imperfection, however gross, has been removed. The same articles of faith are subscribed. The same ritual of devotion is practised. There is reason to fear that the *absolution of the sick* which forms a part of this ritual, is often resorted to as a passport to heaven after a wicked life; and yet it is continued. Perhaps nothing more shocking to reason and humanity ever made a part of a religious system than the damning clauses in the *Athanasian* creed; and yet the obligation of the clergy to declare assent to this creed, and to read it as a part of the public devotion, remains.

The necessary consequence of such a state of things is, that,

Fourthly, Christianity itself is disgraced, and that all religion comes to be considered as a state trick, and a barbarous mummery. It is well known, that in some Popish countries, there are few christians among the higher ranks of men, the religion of the State being in those countries *mistaken* for the religion of the gospel.—This indeed shews a criminal inattention in those who fall into such a mistake; for they ought to consider that christianity has been grievously corrupted, and that their ideas of it should be taken from the New Testament only. It is, however, so natural to reckon christianity to be that which it is held out to be in all the establishments of it, that it cannot but happen that such an error will take place and produce some of the worst consequences. There is probably a greater number of rational christians (that is, of christians upon inquiry) in England, than in all Popish countries. The reason is, that the religious establishment here is Popery *reformed*; and that a considerable body dissent from it, and are often inculcating the necessity of distinguishing between the christianity established by law and that which is taught in the bible. Certain it is, that till this distinction is made, christianity can never recover its just credit and usefulness.

Such then are the effects of civil establishments of religion. May Heaven soon put an end to them. The world will never be generally wise or virtuous or happy, till these enemies to its peace and improvement are demolished. Thanks be to God they are giving way before increasing light. Let them never shew themselves in America. Let no such monster be known there as *human authority in matters of religion*. Let every honest and peaceable man, whatever is his faith, be protected there; and find an effectual defence against the attaks of bigotry and intolerance. In the United States may RELIGION flourish. They cannot be very great and happy if it does not. But let it be a better religion than most of those which have been hitherto professed in the world. Let it be a religion which enforces moral obligations; not a religion which relaxes and evades them.—A tolerant and *Catholic* religion; not a rage for proselitism.—A religion of peace and charity; not a religion that persecutes, *curses* and *damns*.———In a word, let it be the genuine Gospel of *peace* lifting above the world, warming the heart with the *love* of God and his creatures, and sustaining the fortitude of good men by the assured hope of *a uture deliverance from death*, and an infinite reward in the *everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour*.

From the preceding observations it may be concluded, that it is impossible I should not admire the following article in the declaration of rights which forms the foundation of the *Massachusetts'* constitution.—"In this State every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves peaceably and as good subjects of the commonwealth, shall be EQUALLY under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

This is liberal beyond all example.——I should, however, have admired it more had it been MORE liberal, and the words ALL MEN OF ALL RELIGIONS been substituted for the words *every denomination of Christians*.

It appears farther from the preceding observations, that I cannot but dislike the religious tests which make a part of several of the *American* constitutions.—In the *Massachusetts'* constitution it is ordered, that all who take seats in the House of Representatives or Senate shall declare "their firm persuasion of the truth of the Christian religion." The same is required by the *Maryland* constitution, as a condition of being admitted into *any* places of profit or trust. In *Pennsylvania* every member of the House of Representatives is required to declare, that he acknowledges the "Scriptures of the Old & New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." In the state of *Delaware*, that "he believes in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God blessed forever-more." All this is more than is required even in *England*, where, though every person however debauched or atheistical is required to receive the sacrament as a qualification for *inferior* places, no other religious test is imposed on members of parliament than a declaration against Popery.—It is an observation no less just than common, that such tests exclude only *honest* men. The *dis*honest never scruple them.

MONTESQUIEU probably was not a Christian. NEWTON and LOCKE were not *Trinitarians*; and therefore not *Christians* according to the commonly received ideas of Christianity. Would the United States, for this reason, deny such men, were they living, all places of trust and power among them?

REVIVALS.

[The following is the conclusion of an interesting series of original articles on Revivals, lately published in the *Old Hampshire* (Northampton) *Post*.]

Let me in conclusion briefly allude to some of the usual effects of Revivals.—First, these effects are very seldom of long continuance. As regards the whole community, on which they operate, they are *never* of long continuance. Although I have no means of stating or examining a very large number of cases, I will venture the assertion, that *no Revival has been known to continue more than one year*. It is possible I may be wrong in this: but I am confident if there are any instances of their continuing longer, they are but rare exceptions. Of those which constitute the rule, the term of duration *seldom exceeds six months*. And this alone proves them to be unnatural, forced, and not to be relied on. That cannot be a natural, or a healthful state of religious feeling, which from its nature cannot continue—containing within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Religion, if I know any thing about it, is designed to affect men constantly and uniformly, not by starts, and temporary visitation. It wishes to supply principles and motives in accordance with our nature and condition, such as may and must continually operate upon us. How unlike this are the feelings awakened by Revivals! Who ever supposed these feelings *could* continue long? Nay, I will ask who ever desired that these feelings, the state of things which a Revival produces, *should* continue long? It is actually difficult to picture to one's imagination, the case of a town being constantly, for a series of years, under such influence. And verily I doubt, if many individuals can be found, among even the warm friends of Revivals, who on cool and mature deliberation would *desire* that the town in which they live should be *always* visited by one of these excitements. If this be so, does it prove nothing?

Next, consider the effects of Revivals on *individuals*. These too are transient. Of necessity and from their very nature they are so. The change, where a change is produced, is sudden; and sudden changes we all know, are less likely to be permanent than those that are gradual. They are not to be relied on. They form no part of the great system of God's moral or natural government. They are never brought about except by violent and extraordinary causes; and when these cease to operate, as of course they soon must, there is always danger, there is always a probability, that the effects will cease also—and that the subjects of them will be no better, generally worse than before. This of itself is a sufficient reason for distrusting such changes, and not desiring them; or at least for preferring a more gradual and natural progress. Religion of all things is that, in which nothing should be done under the influence of passion or unnatural excitement. And that its great work, its whole work, the change which is regarded as the one thing needful, before which there can be no peace, and after which there need be no fear—that this change is to be wrought and this work done under the direct influence of the strongest animal excitement, is a little more than we can believe—and if true, would be more than we could safely confide in as permanent and sure. Who, let me ask, who of any opinions or feelings would be willing, that any *other* important work should be done under similar influences? Who in worldly matters would take or promise, a bond or pledge in a moment of strong feeling, of great and uncommon excitement? Who would think it safe or right to enter into a social compact with a person acted upon by extraordinary influences, which he knew would not operate long? Not one. All will answer, not one. Yet in religion, the most important, infinitely the most solemn of all concerns, that which calls for the clear and calm exercise of all the powers and all the affections, men do not fear to act upon this principle—to do that which they would think folly and madness in any thing else. Truly it *is* folly and madness in the extreme to rely on the impressions that are made, and the changes that are supposed to be wrought under such circumstances as attend a Revival. Human nature itself must be entirely changed, before it will authorise us to confide in or to desire such things.

So reason and analogy testify. What says experience, *fact*? Let the state of any people a few years after a great Revival give the answer. I can produce instances—indeed I doubt if many of the opposite can be produced—in which the deadness of the calm bears an awful proportion to the violence of the preceeding storm.—There are churches near me, which, if I mistake not, would be glad to throw off half of those whom a Revival swept within their pale in crowds. Children, received into the band of the faithful at an age when it was impossible the mind could receive a clear, or the heart a lasting impression—under the direct operation of an excitement too strong for the rational action of the powers at any age—have forgotten their vows, and returned, not perhaps to actual sin, but to a state inconsistent with the professisns they were required to make—a worse state than before. Men, who once had been slaves to bad habits, but in one of these remarkable seasons were apparently changed, and recognized as members of a pure church, after the season had passed and the excitement subsided have found 'the old man' returning upon them, and yielded themselves up to their former habits, with entire recklessness, or desperation, or, worse than all, in a state of fancied security. Of all the multitude of cases, where such men have been powerfully wrought upon and technically *converted*, I have been able to hear of but one or two instances in which the change was permanent and truly salutary: while the opposite instances may be found at every turn.—I shall be glad if this statement can be refuted. I wish some friend of Revivals would come forward and by a fair examination and exposition of facts, show that in any place there have been as many true conversions as false: as much good as evil produced. It does seem as if they never thought of this—as if they had the evil wholly out of the account, calculated only the many cases that *promised* well, and the few that *proved* well: the multitude that made a good profession, but not the multitude that afterward led inconsistent and bad lives.

Let the promoters of Revivals think of this. Laying aside all bias of opinion, all love of party, all desire of fame and pre-eminence for themselves or their cause—let them fairly weigh the positive evil against the positive good. Let them consider in how large a proportion of what they call conversions, the impressions made, however flattering, pass away with the occasion; how many of the round numbers which in almost every orthodox journal are blazoned forth to the world as 'entertaining a hope,' prove to have deceived themselves & others. Let them consider how few of those on whom lasting impressions are made, are actually *improved*, made better, more humble, more temperate, honest & truly religious. Let them substract from the amount all on whom the impressions are mere impressions—enlisting strong feelings—awakening new zeal—strengthening attachment to doctrine, party, profession, and all outward service, but not mending the temper, not subduing the passions, not purifying the heart, not making better fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, children or servants, neighbors or members of society. Let them number the cases in which a deceiving self-complacency is produced—the kind sympathies chilled—the charities of life checked—the temper soured—bigotry strengthened—idle and malicious talebearing encouraged—alienation of friends occasioned—parents led to forsake their houses and neglect their children—children allowed, if not taught, to show disrespect and disobedience to *unbelieving* parents—servants and the young generally seduced from their appointed duties and lifted up with pleasing but most hurtful notions of self-importance—and in a word, religion made to consist in any thing & every thing *but a good life*—I say, let the friends and promoters of Revivals think of these things—impartially, seriously, and in the fear of God, let them weigh them against the certain, permanent good resulting from these excitements—and let them say, whether they can in conscience encourage what are now called Revivals—whether they believe them to be *the work of God's Spirit*, and *conducive to man's best interests*.

THE INTELLIGENCER.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN LOVE.....PAUL.

GARDINER, FRIDAY, FEB. 8.

"PHILOS" AND "B." In order that our readers may understand the facts in relation to the letter published in our last, signed *Philos*, and the reply to the same by our correspondent *B.* inserted in another column of this week's paper, it may not be improper for us to say, that a communication signed by the latter appeared in the Intelligencer of the 21st of September last, commenting freely and spiritedly upon a certain sermon delivered in the town where B. resides, in which the preacher, among other things equally unsupported by facts, asserted that the word *katakrithesetai*, rendered *shall be damned* in the text, "he that believeth not shall be damned," signified, according to the best lexicographers of the present day, "*eternal exclusion from the mercy and favor of God*"! B. in the communication alluded to, averred that "such, according to the best Greek lexicons, is *not* the meaning of the word 'damned' in the text, and challenged the preacher to "produce his lexicon that gives such a signification to the word in question."

In about two months afterwards, B. received through the medium of the New-Sharon Post-Office,—where he resides,—a long letter addressed to him by name, signed *Philos*, dated, "Land of *Truth*, Nov. 1827, mailed in a distant town and charged twelve and an half cents postage. This is the letter which was published in our last. We have no doubt that it was written in New-Sharon in the immediate neighborhood of B. and are, moreover, strongly suspicious,—though in this we may not be correct,—that it was written by the very "preacher"—perhaps assisted by some of his friends—whose sermon was the subject of our correspondent's animadversions, and sent off some distance to return by mail. If we are correct in this,—such was the deception practised by Philos in order to make B. believe a falsehood—viz: that the letter was not written by a person in New-Sharon, but that it was the production of some unknown individual at a distance,—we must say, that instead of being dated "Land of *Truth*," it ought rather to have been dated "Land of *Deception*;" for certainly, we believe, there was more deception than truth as to the impression intended to be made by the writer in relation to the place where his letter originated.

As Philos, by withholding his name and place of residence from B. put it out of the power, (as he probably intended to do, fearing to be confronted) of the latter to reply to him either *in propria persona* or by a private letter, B. learning that manuscript copies of Philos' letter were circulating among the people of N. Sharon, and being unwilling that his errors should go unrefuted, deemed it expedient to forward us for publication both the letter of Philos and his reply thereto. In giving publicity to both we have been governed by the hope that truth might thereby be elicited.

It does not, we suppose, belong to us to take any part in this controversy; still we may be permitted to remark, that the manifest evasions and mere *ipse dixits* of Philos betray a consciousness of the weakness of his cause, which well might make him desirous of remaining *incog.* and of thus putting it out of the power of B. to reply to him. If, as he wants to make it out, "the preacher" was correct in stating to his hearers that *katakrithesetai*, according to the best Greek lexicographers, signifies "an eternal exclusion from the mercy and favor of God," why did he not promptly and manfully attend to the call of B. for the lexicon which gives this as the definition of that verb? Why? The answer is obvious. It was not in his power to do it. He cannot but know that "the preacher" stated that which is not true. *Katakrithesetai* (or *katakrino*) does *not* signify "an eternal exclusion from the mercy and favor of God;" and all Philos' quibbles and *ipse dixits* together with his inferences piled upon inferences built upon those unsupported assertions, will have no effect upon B. or any other person who knows enough to distinguish between argument and declamation.

DEDICATION OF CHILDREN. It is probably known to most persons, that there is a practice in Universalist Churches of dedicating children to Almighty God. This is a solemn and interesting service and as our readers might be pleased to see the form used by the minister at the dedication, we copy it below.

[Pronouncing the childs' name] "We dedicate thee to Him, to whom thou properly belongest, to be Baptized with his Baptism, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and we pronounce upon thee, that blessing which he commanded his ministers, Moses and Aaron and his sons to pronounce upon his people, saying—"The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give the Peace! *Amen.*"

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. In consequence of the late decision of Judge Story in Providence, relative to the incompetency of a witness on account of his religious opinions, the General Assembly of Rhode Island have lately passed, with great unanimity, the following Act:

"An act declaratory of the laws of this State, relating to freedom of opinion in maters of religion.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly and by authority thereof it is enacted—That by the laws of this State, all men are free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same do not in any wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil rights or capacities; and that no man's opinions, in matters of religion, his belief or disbelief, *can be legally inquired into*, or be made *a subject of investigation with a view to his qualifications to hold office or give testimony* by *any* man or men acting *judicially* or *legislatively*."

By the way we would inquire if the principles of the Common Law of England, on which Judge S. predicated his decision, are yet in force in *this* State or not? If they are, it seems to us our Legislature, which is now in session, would do the State essential service by passing an act similar to the above before its adjournment. It ought not in a free State like this, to be in the power of any sectarian Judge to reject as an incompetent witness a man who may not hold to sentiments agreeing with those of the bench.

CATHOLICISM. In Holland preachers of all denominations are equally supported by the government of the country. The principal sects are the Menonites or Anabaptists, Lutherans, Reformed Church and Papists.—There are a few Jews also. If religion is to be supported by the civil government at all, it is certainly the most republican to give all sects an equal right to the general fund. But we believe this is not done in any European nation except Holland.

We have a number of towns in Maine where the "ministerial fund," arising from the income or sale of lands originally granted them by law at the time of their incorporation, is divided among the several religious denominations therein, according to the number of rateable polls belonging to each Society. Perhaps this may not be in strict accordance with the intentions of the Legislature which reserved a lot of land for the support of the Christian ministry in each town; but it is obviously more just and equal, and occasions infinitely less quarrelling, than if the whole proceeds were given to any one exclusively.

RELIGIOUS NEWSPAPERS. There are now published in the United States, (speaking after the manner* of a late account circulated in the limitarian papers,) twelve religious periodical publications, which go statedly forth exerting a powerful influence throughout the country in the cause of truth and righteousness;—viz. Universalist Magazine, Christian Intelligencer, Religious Inquirer, Gospel Advocate, Christian Telescope, Utica Magazine, Liberalist, Olive Branch, Gospel Preacher, Day Star, Dialogical Instructer, & Ch. Repository. Possibly there may be one or two others, which, if there are, as we do not exchange with them, are unknown to us.

We understand that our Rev. Br. EDWARD TURNER, Pastor of the First Universalist Church and Society in Portsmouth, N. H. has been invited to the pastoral charge of the Unitarian Church in Charlton, Mass. We are happy to see this liberality on the part of our Unitarian brethren extended towards a venerable and highly useful Universalist clergyman.

We copy the following from the United States (Philadelphia) Gazette. It appeared originally in the Boston Evening Bulletin, edited by Mr. Jenks.

JUDICIAL TESTIMONY. Suppose a witness offered to be sworn, the opposite party objected on account of the infamy of his character. Ah, says the witness, "I believe in future rewards and punishments." But, says the objector, you was never known to speak the truth, when it was your interest to tell a lie. You never paid a debt, when you could cheat your creditor. You stand convicted by the unanimous voice of the public as a liar, a knave and a hypocrite. More than that, you was convicted of sheep stealing. But I have been pardoned by the governor, under the great seal of the state, says the witness, which has, with magic power, restored me to competency.—You have this very term been convicted of perjury, says the objector—But, says the witness, although a jury of my country have, on the clearest testimony, given their verdict against me, the court have not done what at any moment they can, and in a few minutes certainly will do, pronounce judgment, by which I shall be forever disqualified. I am *at this instant of time*, what, after the formal sentence I never can be, a competent witness. Besides, I have a very *religious belief*, which is all that the law in my case requires. I hold my book higher, and read my prayers louder than any man in the church. I pray your honors, am I not a competent witness? Certainly, says the court, according to *common law*, as held by *sound* lawyers. You must therefore be sworn.

* An account is circulating among the limitarian newspapers, which purports to give a list of all the "religious papers" in the U. S. (twenty-four in number, as they make it,) in which is not inserted the name of one of the above periodicals. The list is enriched, however, with the name of the "Anti-Universalist"—or, as the Fall River Monitor more justly calls it, the Anti-Christian;—We do not recollect whether it contains the "Castigator" and the "Correspondent," or not.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

"B's." REPLY TO "PHILOS."

In endeavoring to answer the letter of "*Philos*," [inserted in your paper of last week,] I would just observe in the outset, that whoever the person may be, his arguments go farther to the refutation of his own doctrine, than of mine. He professes to believe that only a part of the human family will be eternally miserable, but, unfortunately for him, his arguments *go to prove* that *all* will be thus miserable. I would wish our readers to bear this in mind, and see, if in the result, this does not prove to be the case.

After stating that I have assumed a ground that is wholly untenable and taken upon me the character of a braggadocio, he says: "You unfortunately hit on a point which a better informed champion would have approached with more caution." One would conclude that he considered himself the "better informed champion;" but I do not see as he approached it with any "more caution" than myself. If he had approached it with more caution, he would have avoided a plain contradiction, which every one must see, who takes the pains to peruse his article. But unless some who are prejudiced in his favour might overlook it, I will just note it; he says, "you have made statements which you are *unable to prove*, and have commited errors, which inexperience and very limited advantages only, can excuse." He says, again, "I was for sometime at a loss to determine in what Lexicon you found these strange definitions, you prefixed to katakrino." "I at last turned to Schrevelius, and *succeeded in tracing them out.*"! Does Philos mean to be understood, I have stated things that I cannot prove myself, but that *he* can prove them *for* me? I must either understand him so, or say he has contradicted himself. Let our readers judge whether I have any right to draw this conclusion or not. But, to proceed. He goes on to state, that "there are three definitions there given, and disregarding the two last, you seem to have gathered yours from the Latin Judico, which is, no doubt, the reason why your definition is so deformed a one." Why does he call it *my* definition? Has he not stated above, that it is *Schrevelius'*? and again, I cannot see why the two last definitions there given are not as deformed as the first, as they certainly do not prove his doctrine of eternal misery, but rather go to prove my doctrine. Let any one examine the definition of the authors above alluded to, which he calls the most distinguished lexicographers that he has consulted, viz. Robinson and Parkhurst, and see if he has any right to say they are in favour of him. Robinson, says he, defines katakrino, to give judgment, to condemn, to subject to condemnation, and punishment, to punish. What is become of Philos' "eternal exclusion from the mercy and favour of God?" Does he not keep it "*sub umbra*" as yet? I certainly must claim the above authors as in favor of my opinion. He seems to think I am ignorant of the method, that he and others take, to make null and void the definitions of the above mentioned distinguished Lexcographers. I can tell him that I am not, but frequently hear it asserted as destitute of evidence as I find it above. I say it is *not a fact*, and my assertion is as good as his, till he produces some evidence. For my part, I do not believe that the sacred writers have ever used a word in a sense different from that in which it was generally received. Suppose they had preached this doctrine of damnation to the Greeks, as doubtless they did, how would they have understood them? Certainly not to mean eternal misery, for that word to them conveyed *no such idea*. The Apostles, to have been plain, would have informed them that they had affixed another definition to the word in question; but I cannot find as they have intimated any such thing in all their writings, and therefore, I am not willing to believe any such thing from the testimony of any orthodox divine in Christendom, with no more evidence than their bare assertion. They are very easily made and as easily contradicted. And now we come to the main bulwark and principal defence of his favourite doctrine of eternal misery. "But katakrithesetai" (as though a derivative could convey an idea entirely different from its primitive) the word in question is defined by Schleusner, "He shall be excluded from the happiness of the righteous in this and the coming world,—and be sorely tormented,"—And by Rosenmuller, "He shall be tormented in his sins, with everlasting punishment." Does not this definition prove too much? Does it not prove, universal, eternal damnation. Who of us can say he never was an unbeliever? None. Then surely, if all have been unbelievers, all must suffer the penalty. It is very unfortunate for Philos that the text did not read, "He that continueth not to believe to the end of time." He is determined to make it read so however at all hazards. I am willing to let the connexion of a word determine its meaning, and this is the very reason why I cannot understand *katakritheselai* in the verse, to mean eternal exclusion from mercy. According to the idea that has hitherto generally been held to, it represents that a person may actually commit a crime, and have sentence of eternal exclusion passed upon him, and after that, believe and be saved from it.—If this be true, (and I can see no way to avoid it) then, I cannot see why a person may not make his escape from Hell, if he should be so unfortunate as to get there.

"Perhaps you will say," says he, "the connexion does not require such a construction." True, I think it does not. In endeavoring to answer these questions, which he gravely asks for me, he shows his weak side; for he says, "the punishment of the wicked is here put in contrast with the happiness of the righteous, and neither in this, nor in any other similar passage, that can be produced, is there the least intimation but that one will endure as long as the other." Now, if we suppose the happiness of the righteous to be eternal, which you will readily grant, we virtually say, the punishment of the wicked will be of equal duration." Who does not see that this argument, if such it may be called, runs against his own doctrine? I would ask Philos one question, viz. For what are the wicked punished in another world? Doubtless, he will say, for sin, or in other words, transgression against the law of God, or disobedience. Now let us take his own argument. If the reward of obedience will be eternal happiness, what then is the need of a Saviour? Friend Philos ought not to find fault with us for turning his arguments against his own doctrine.

My opponent thinks that a person cannot be condemned without being condemned to some punishment. I would ask him if condemnation is not itself a punishment? If not, I cannot see as any are or can be punished in this world for sin excepting it be temporal punishment inflicted on the body. Does he not suppose that Peter was punished for denying his Master when he went out and wept bitterly? If he was, condemnation was the cause of it.—Again, if condemnation be not punishment I do not see but the notoriously abandoned character may be as happy in this world as the most pious and devout. Our readers may see that this argument falls to the ground as harmless as a meteor of night, and of course his inferences drawn ftom it. I believe that a person cannot be saved while in a state of unbelief, as much as any one, and for a very good reason, because misery is a constant attendant of sin and unbelief. Therefore when Philos can produce a single passage within the lids of the sacred volume, that even intimates that any one will continue eternally in a state of unbelief, that one I believe will be "eternally damned."

He next takes up John iii. 13. and says it is not the same word. But is it not a word of the *same import*? which is what was meant to be conveyed in saying it was the same word. Is not the original word in the 3d chapter of John, or its derivatives, frequently translated into the same word in English? I think we can find it so in a number of instances. In the 3d chapter of Mark and the 29th verse, we find this same word, viz. *krisis* translated damnation. Our readers can turn to the passage at their leisure and read for themselves. And likewise in Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians xi chap. 29 v. we find *krima* translated the same

You have not, says he, admitted the idea of a probation. I have not as it is generally understood, for the following reasons. 1st, it is no where to be found in the bible, and 2d, because it founds salvation wholly on merit. For if we admit a state of probation or trial and every one is to be rewarded in another world according to the deeds done in this state of trial, then the Saviour's mission into this world was wholly unnecessary, unless we say that he came to save men from the punishment due to their crimes which is not only absurd but unscriptural. After drawing an inference from my statement, that truth is unalterable, he brings forward what he calls no doubt a weighty argument. "We will suppose, says he, a man of notoriously bad character addicted to every vice, and a pest to the community. It is truth he is a bad man. Ere long he sees his errors and reforms and becomes a virtuous member of society and a good man." Now, kind reader, what does this prove? Why nothing only that his idea of the word under consideration is incorrect; for here is one man who has been an unbeliever of the grossest kind, and has escaped the preacher's "eternal exclusion from the mercy and favour of God," and why may not another? Such arguments as these only show to what miserable subterfuges the man is driven to support his doctrine. I shall not say any thing on what he says on Romans xi. 32. for his opinion exactly accords with mine. In his observations on Gal. iii. 22. he seems to intimate that although God determined from all eternity to make some endlessly miserable, yet he has opened a way by which they may be saved from it, and therefore man has the power of thwarting the purposes of God which he purposed in Himself before the world was. How much short of blasphemy is this! My friend Philos appears to be very solicitous to know my opinion on this xvi. of Mark, 16th verse. I think if he will allow himself to read the foregoing remarks he would not remain a moment ignorant. But lest he may misrepresent them all as he has done in his remarks above, I will state it in as few words as possible. 1st. I believe that the damnation will be as extensive as the unbelief, i. e. all that do not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ will as assuredly be damned as God is true: and 2d. I believe that some will remain in sin and unbelief till Christ delivers the kingdom to the Father and God be all in all,—Till God reconciles all things to himself by Jesus Christ—Till all come to Christ who were given to him in the Covenant of redemption—Till Christ effects the object of his mission, which was to destroy death and him that has the power of it, which is the devil, and no longer.

In speaking of the article which he is endeavoring to answer, he says—"you ought to know that you are answerable with your reputation to quote it verbatim." I do not see why I am so, if I get exactly his idea. "If this be a fair specimen of the discourse, says he, (and I am confident it is) I should not think it the production of a sound mind"—A very good observation indeed, but suppose I did not get it exactly verbatim,—that I said hell, where he said damned. Suppose I had stated that he said thus. The word translated, shall be damned, in the text does not mean horror of conscience neither in this world nor that which is to come, but punishment in fire and brimstone, as he says he did—what then? I cannot see as it would have made it any less harsh. It seems to me that Philos is not strictly orthodox. He certainly is not of the mind of the "Preacher," for he said the terms were none too harsh. If the Bible teaches such a doctrine surely it is none too "foul"; for Bible doctrine ought to be preached whether men will hear or whether they will forbear. Now Philos gives his opinion with reasons for his belief.—"That there are wicked men, and that they die in their sins, are facts which I cannot deny; what their final doom will be the scriptures inform us." Before we examine the passages he has cited we will just make a few remarks on his belief.—He believes there are wicked men in the world, and so do I. But does he believe *all* men are wicked or sinners? He certainly does if he is a true Calvinist. He believes that his best deeds deserve eternal misery, and if so he must be very wicked indeed. No mortal man is free from sin. With this agrees the word of John. "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." If this argument prove any thing it proves that all men must be eternally miserable, because all die in their sins.

We will now consult the passage that he cites me as proof of his doctrine; and first, Matt. xiii. 41, 42. The reader will observe that whatever they were that were represented which should be cast into a lake of fire, were gathered out of Christ's kingdom, and called in the verse above tares; whatever these tares were, it is evident they were combustible and capable of being consumed. Now why are we not willing to let the parable have all its bearings. For if the tares represent all those things that offend and them that do iniquity and the tares were burned up, it follows of course that they would be burned up or destroyed. It seems rather inconsistent that the tares or wheat should represent persons, because this would insinuate that wheat were once all tares, which would be absurd. There is another difficulty arising: If tares represent wicked men, who were those men that slept while the enemy sowed them? If wheat mean righteous men, then Christ sowed righteous men in this world, and if so they never were sinners. But Philos no doubt believes that Christ sowed the righteous men in the world, and that the devil sowed the tares while the righteous were asleep. As no person in the free exercise of his reason can believe that the devil sowed wicked men in this world, so no one can believe that the tares in the text represent wicked men. If these remarks are correct, then Philos can find no support for his doctrine in this text.

2d. Matt. xxv. 41, 46. On this passage one would naturally inquire *when it was* that our Saviour would pass this sentence? We are cited to the 31st verse of 25th chapter. This is not satisfactory, for in this verse it reads, "when the Son of man shall come in his glory," &c. The question arises again, *when* will that be? Turn to the 30th verse of the preceding chapter and read thence to the 35th. There we have a declaration of the Son of man's coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, together with a time before which it should take place, viz. before *that generation should pass away*. This passage certainly then does not prove his doctrine.

3d. First of Thess. i. 9. This passage unfortunately for him if his doctrine be true, proves too much. How a person can be destroyed and still exist in a state of punishment, is to me inconceivable.

In order to prove the duration of punishment, he has recourse to the Greek word *aionios*, "which, he says, is found above seventy times in the New Testament. Six times is it applied to the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and in every other instance that now occurs to me it undeniably means an eternal duration." So Philos seems to be in doubt whether these six cases first mentioned "*undeniably* mean eternal duration." It seems to him to be rather inconsistent, however, that the sacred writers should use this word so many times and in only six of them limit it. But is this a fact? I think this is *not* altogether "undeniable." I think it remains to be proved whether it is used *at all* in that sense by the sacred writers. I think that word as well as all other adjectives when added to a substantive partakes of the significant duration or size of the substantive to which it is added. For instance, when we prefix the adjective *great* to an *apple* or a *mountain*, it does not intimate that the apple is *as large* as the mountain, although both may be *great*; so of the word great or good when applied to Deity; they do not convey an idea any less denominative than though the word

eternal were prefixed to them. For if God is now good, he will forever remain so, because he is unchangeable. There is another thing which seems to me to be more inconsistent than that which Philos stumbles at, viz. that the sacred writers should use *aionios*, a derivative word, over seventy times giving it an unlimited signification, and use *aion*, the primitive, a considerable number of times, and *never in one instance* used it to convey an idea of *Eternity*; and why should they not use *aion* to convey an idea of Eternity, as well *aionios* to convey an idea of Eternal.

Who would suppose that any judicious theologian would do this? Would not a "better informed champion have approached this word with more caution?" It appears to be conclusive that if *aionios* means Eternal, *aion* means Eternity. But do we find it any where so used in the Bible? Certainly not, as far as I am acquainted, but exactly the contrary. It is frequently mentioned as having an end. As one instance I would cite our readers to the connexion where *aionios* is found and translated Eternal, Everlasting, viz, Matt. xxiv. 3. where the disciples question Christ to know when the "*end* of *aion*" should take place. Now to have translated it *Eternity* here would have made nonsense of the whole. As one who hates Philos' errors but loves his person, I intreat of him, with these facts before him, to determine the *true meaning* of *aionios*. What better way is there to find the real definition of a word than to go to its root? for a primitive word cannot convey an idea so different from the derivative. Therefore as *aion* means *age* wherever it is used in scripture, *aionios* must mean *agelasting* or something to that amount. B.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

LETTER, NO. 3.

My Dear Son:

Sabbath schools were originally instituted from the best of motives, and were productive of salutary effects. Idle, thoughtless and ignorant children were collected out of the public streets and taught to read, reflect and think; their duties to their Creator and their fellow creatures were impressed on their minds; habits of sobriety, temperance, cleanliness and industry, were taught, and the youth were rescued from a thousand vices. Such I hope is the case in most instances now; but I fear there are cases, where the misty notions of metaphysical theology are taught, together with a jargon of words destitute of definite ideas, which perplex alike the mind of the philosopher and the child. What good effect could possibly arise from instructing a child into the gloomy philosophy of Calvin, of teaching him that he is totally depraved, born into the world an heir to everlasting misery, from which he can never be delivered but by the effect of a miracle; and then fill his mind with witch stories, until he has lost his senses? Such things ought never to be done, and I have no doubt you accord with me in this opinion.

You have not informed me whether the Sabbath is well regarded, and the gospel regularly preached or not. If not, a Sabbath school will be of the first importance. When the mind is early instructed to love and worship the God of the Universe, and made acquainted with his atributes, it will never afterwards cease to reverence and love him. Continual associations of the power, omnipresence and benevolence of our Heavenly Father, will mingle with the daily events of our life, and be sources of happiness almost unspeakable. Conscious that we are under the care and protection of an Almighty friend, we shall meet the various events of life with a calm, composed mind, and never sink under disappointment, trouble and care.

In tracing the history of the world from the creation of man to the crucifixion of our Saviour, an immense catalogue of crimes is unfolded, and in all instances, miseries and punishment were sure to follow. These crimes almost always had their source from an improper indulgence of the passions. The friend of youth should spare no pains in teaching the science of governing them. An act of wild unrestrained anger may make a man miserable through life. An undue proportion of pride will deprive ourselves and all with whom we are connected, of peace and the sweets of friendship. A dull sluggish habit of acting and thinking, produces, justly, poverty and contempt. Deceitful pleasure may allure us into her intoxicating lap, and when we awake, we shall find ourselves shorn of our strength and honor, and like Manoah's son, be scoffed at by the ungodly Philistines. Time would fail me to relate the evils which arise to our race from an improper indulgence of the passions. Yet we have not one passion which is unnecessary; each one is useful when regulated by the laws of wisdom, of prudence, of conscience and of God. This wisdom should be early imprinted on the mind. The beauty of holiness cannot too early be impressed on the heart. The chance is altogether in favor of early sowing. Once get the taste and the habits rightly directed and immortal beings are seen raised to aspirations after true glory and honor and never-ending peace; made daily blessings to their fellow beings, and continually adding to the sum of human happiness.

Instructions of this kind abound in the bible. You will find more useful instruction for youth in the first four chapters of the Proverbs of Solomon, than in any four hundred volumes ever written by Calvin and his followers. Children should never be taught to be sectarians, to despise and hate those whose religious opinions may be different from their own, for evil and bitter consequences always ensue; both parties are made worse.

I have thus given you a general view of my opinion of Sabbath schools; but I submit it for your consideration only. Engaged in what you think your duty, you will pursue it in such a manner as infinite wisdom shall point out On that we should rely in every action of our lives.

Affectionately, D.

THE CHRONICLE.

"AND CATCH THE MANNERS LIVING AS THEY RISE."

GARDINER, FRIDAY, FEB. 8, 1828.

CONGRESS. At the commencement of the present session of Congress we heard much said that the business of the nation was to be industriously and devotedly attended to, and that that body would probably be able to adjourn by the fourth of the next month. Already it has been in session more than two months and as yet *only two laws have been passed*,—one, we believe, very patriotically making provisions for their own pay out of the public treasury, and the other increasing the salary of the Post-Master General. The principal part of the time, as far as we can learn, is taken up in fanning the embers of party and in debating subjects designed to have favorable or unfavorable effects upon the prospects of the rival candidates for the Presidency. Surely for such substantial services as this, the people can afford to pay Congress fifteen or sixteen hundred dollars a day.

MAINE STATE HOUSE. Our readers have already been informed that a resolve has passed the Senate 15 to 4 making appropriations for the erection of public State buildings in Augusta. It becomes our duty now to add that the same resolve, without any amendments, has passed the House also to be engrossed 91 to 52, and has gone to, and been approved by, the Governor. We rejoice that this "everlasting question," as it has been called, is at last put to rest. It has already cost the State an immense sum of money and mingled itself greatly with almost all other subjects of legislation. It is thought, we understand, that enough of the land appropriated by the resolve, will be readily purchased by certain wealthy individuals to enable the Governor and the Commissioner to proceed immediately to effect the object contemplated in the resolve. According to the present laws, the Legislature will hold three sessions more in Portland,—from and after that time it will meet in Augusta where the public buildings will have been prepared to receive it.

LOUISIANA. The new Legislature of Louisiana which is now in session, consists, says the (Philadelphia) National Gazette, of a very large majority of Adams men.—In the Senate 13 to 4 and about the same proportion in the House. On the 8th ult. Committees being mostly administration men, were appointed by both branches of the Legislature to wait on Gen. Jackson, who was in N. Orleans, celebrating the anniversary of his battle, and to tender him the honors of the occasion. The day proved unpleasant, it being rainy.

President Adams and General Jackson, if we may believe the papers, are both the greatest villains, and the most dangerous men, that were ever suffered to go unhung, and the purest patriots and the greatest saints that ever come short of deification. We suspect, after all, that they are both *men!* undoubtedly great men;—one perhaps more particularly excelling as a statesman and the other as a warrior, but both having the infirmities common to our race.

Much anxiety exists to know whether Madison and Monroe consent to stand as candidates on the list of Electors nominated by the Adams Convention on the 8th of last month. We have looked into every one of our southern papers for two or three weeks past expecting to find their notes declining the nomination—presuming that they would not wish to take any public stand in relation to the controversy about the Presidency,—but as yet our search has been fruitless.

A convention in Albany, consisting of 23 members of the Senate and 87 Assemblymen, have nearly unanimously nominated General Jackson for President, and Mr. Calhoun for Vice President.

THE WEATHER. The weather in this vicinity for nearly a week past, has been unusually mild for the season—seeming to us much more like April than February. What little sleighing we had a week ago, has vanished before the warm rays of the sun. We shall probably have more snow, for "winter never rots in the sky," but the season is now so far spent that it may be doubted whether we shall this year have much more of the substantial advantages of a Kennebec winter.

CONGRESSIONAL.

[From the Boston Courier.]

WASHINGTON, JAN. 28. In the Senate today Col. Hayne, of S. C. presented a memorial from sundry citizens of Westborough, in the County of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, remonstrationg against the imposition of any further duties on importations.

The same memorial was presented in the House of Representatives this morning by Mr. Cambreleng of New-York.

Mr. Sergeant of Philadelphia presented a memorial from an anti-tariff meeting in Philadelphia, signed by the chairman and two secretaries, remonstrating against any further duties on imports. Mr. S. remarked that he dissented altogether from the views of the subject taken by the memorialists, yet as he knew the chairman and secretaries to be men of great respectability, he moved that the memorial be referred to the committee on manufactures and printed. It is stated in letters from Philadelphia that the meeting from which this remonstrance emanated was composed of about one hundred and twenty persons, chiefly agents of foreign manufacturers.

The unfinished business of Saturday. *Mr. Chilton's Resolutions*, were then called up.—These resolutions have undergone so many modifications by Mr. Chilton and amendments by other members, that they are now pretty nearly in the condition of the old gentleman's silk stockings, which had been darned so often, that none of the original material was left; yet still they were a pair of stockings. Mr. Buckner of Kentucky first took the floor, and said he should have asked for the resolutions as first proposed, if there had been no discussion, and it was not his intention now to indulge in personalities, in prolonging the discussion. He noticed the several modifications which had been made by his colleague, from which he inferred that opinions on some points respecting the policy to be pursued, had been suggested in the course of the debate. The resolutions he said, were now no more like what they were originally, than the tumbler on the desk before him was like the desk. He heard now nothing of high salaries—nothing of reducing the per diem allowance of members. He inferred that these charges were adopted after a night's consultation. He replied to the remarks of Mr. Randolph, i which that gentleman declared himself the adversary of any man that should come into the chair of the chief magistrate without a majority of the votes of the people; yet, he said that gentleman, and all the representatives from Virginia, did vote for Mr. Crawford and endeavor to make him prominent, although he came to the house as a candidate with much less than a majority of the people's votes.

Mr. Washington, (a new member from Maryland) spoke very briefly against the proposed inquiry, believing that there was no cause for it. Mr. Ingham then spoke for more than half an hour, vehemently "inculpating" the administration, but wishing that the inquiry might not be made, because it would end in nothing. Mr. Vance of Ohio followed, and in reply to the reiterated cry from the opposition that they had come here to do the public business and go home, said that we, (the administration party) had no power to do the business of the nation—the power had been taken from them by the construction of the House. He then began to analyze the composition of the various standing committees, shewing that all of them had majorities of opposition members, and all but two a chairman from the same party. Mr. Vance was called to *Order* by Mr. Kremer, but the Speaker permitted him to proceed. He was again called to *Order* by Mr. M'Duffie. The Chair again decided in favor of Mr. Vance, and M'Duffie appealed from the decision—On the question of *appeal*, on motion of Wright of Ohio, the ayes and noes were ordered, but before the clerk had begun to call the vote, Bartlett of New-Hampshire made a motion to adjourn, which was carried by a large majority. Another storm, the elements of which were evidently in great commotion, was thus prevented, or, at least, postponed to another day.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 29. In Congress nothing of any importance has been completed. The bill for the relief of revolutionary officers underwent further discussion in the Senate. Mr. Smith, of S. C. made a long and determined speech against it. In the House of Representatives, the unfinished business of yesterday was taken up, after the reports of committees. The question pending at the adjournment, was the appeal from the decision of the Chair, by Mr. McDuffie. It was put in this form—"Shall the decision of the Chair be the judgment of the House?" and it was carried in the affirmative, ayes 91, noes 62. So the decision of the Chair was supported, and Mr. Vance went on with his speech. Mr. Pearce, of Rhode-Island, spoke about an hour, and was followed by Mr. Bell of Tennessee, who spoke with great vehemence, but, according to our notions, very sensibly.—When Mr. Bell, had finished, Mr. Dorsey, of Maryland, moved for an adjournment, but the House refused to adjourn. Mr. Dorsey then took the floor to speak upon the resolution, but in a few minutes gave way for a new motion to adjourn; which was carried.

SIGNS OF PARTY DISCIPLINE. In the House of Representatives, Jan. 25, during the debate on Mr. Chilton's resolutions, Mr. Randolph said—Before I set down, one word to all whom it may concern. This country is now divided into two adversary parties; and they must shut their eyes to the fact, who do not know that this House is nearly as equally divided; *fas est ab hoste doceri*. We see one of the opposite party who are willing to throw on us the responsibility of measures, sitting still, demure and silent, bringing forward no proposition; another bringing forward propositions upon which our adversaries never commit themselves but after a night's reflection. What is the consequence? Although I firmly believe that they are a minority; yet they will constitute the efficient majority, and will throw upon us the responsibility of any measures they may bring forward. This is a new sort of political justice. The present inquiry will end in smoke; and I am not disposed to fan the fires, and raise the smoke under which the adversary may make his escape. I stand here the adversary *quo ad hoc* of any man who is put at the head of the government otherwise than by a majority of the votes of the people. If we amend the constitution, therefore, I am not for the hereditary system. Even if we have a majority, said Mr. R. and the President was with us, and gave us his cordial co-operation, as Thomas Jefferson did, in spite of all efforts made to thwart him; and where was an opposition ever stronger? I believe that with the House so equally balanced, and I will take the vote for Speaker as the criterion, with the scale just vibrating, it would be hardly possible for the majority to get along with any measure, however wise, against a phalanx from whom we cannot cut off even a straggler, while we are acting as raw, undisciplined militia. Though under a most popular President, the party was obliged to consult together—he would not use a barbarous term which he first heard in this country about the time to which he had referred—the party was obliged to consult together out of doors, so as not to lose the valuable time of the House; they were obliged to act in concert. If we do not do so now, it was not for him to predict the consequences. He would recommend to young members [addressing himself towards Mr. Chilton,] to follow the advice given to a young physician, to throw in no medicine. He would suggest to them to prescribe nothing more than a wise abstinence.

In reply to these remarks, on the next day, Mr. Wright of Ohio, said—

In descanting upon the situation of things here, the gentleman from Virginia has adverted to what he is pleased to term the workings of an organized phalanx on our side of the House; he lamented the want of concert on his, and depicted the introduction of propositions without consultation and agreement. He took occasion to admonish the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Chilton), that young physicians should stand by, and not attempt to administer medicine. Adverting to the success attending the efforts of the party with whom he acted formerly, he attributed their success to concert, consultation, and arrangements out of doors. The young doctors did not then introduce propositions, which the party did not approve of. So what follows from all this? Will any gentleman rise in his place on this floor and say that the legislation of Congress, in order to make it subservient to party purposes, shall be subjected to the control of a secret, irresponsible caucus, out of doors? A caucus that shall not only determine what propositions shall be introduced, but the time of their introduction, and the persons who shall bring forward or advocate them? Are we come to that, Sir? I trust in God, Sir, that time never will arrive, and that no one will be found here, hardy enough to avow such a purpose. But, Sir, if the time ever shall arrive, and the gentleman from Virginia or any other gentleman, shall avow such a plan and attempt to bring it into practise here, that he will meet the indignant frown of the House and the nation, and be put down forever.

GRECIAN PIRATES. Mr. Miller, the American philanthropist in Greece, complains of the misconduct of many Greeks, and the difficulties he encountered in executing his commission of distributing the supplies, sent from America. In one instance, he was plundered of two hundred barrels of provisions.—[Me. Inq.]

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"H. W." of Solon shall appear in our next. What is the reason that we do not hear from our venerated Portsmouth correspondent of late? We have not forgotten the promise of "T. G. F."

Anonymous correspondents are informed, that if they think the Editor is not worthy to be trusted, confidentially, with their real names, or if they dare not have him know who they are, they need not be disappointed if their requests for insertion are not complied with.

A communication from "Philos, Jr." is received, threatening sore indignation towards us, if we should dare fulfil the promise we made in our last to publish this week B's. reply to Philos, and pledging himself, if it does appear in print, to use all his power "to drive the writer [B.] out of town"! We have no doubt that Philos, Jr. is a remarkable *christian*—for he manifests much of the *christian* spirit of humility and good will; but he is informed that *common decency* at least is expected from every one who writes for this paper.

MARRIED,

In Boston, by Rev. Mr. Streeter, Mr. Ebed Whiton to Miss Esther C. Richardson; Mr. John Hollis to Miss Nancy French. By Rev. Mr. Ballou, Horatio N. Bowker, Esq. to Miss Susan M. Richardson; Mr. Henry Reed, of Cape Ann, to Mrs. Ann A. Hayward.

In Woolwich, by the Rev. Mr. Adams, Mr. James C. Tallman, of Bath, to Miss Jane R. Green, of the former place.

DIED,

A man by the name of *Bernard Haviland*, was found dead in the road in Pittston, on Thursday morning, 31st ult.; a Coroner's Inquest was held, verdict "came to his death by misfortune." He was an Irishman apparently about 25 years of age, middling stature, very much pitted with the small pox,—had resided in this village the most part of his time for two months past, was a man of pretty good information, and from appearance, of regular deportment—had said that he had two brothers living in the city of New-York. He was removed by the Coroner to this place, and decently interred on Friday last.

New-York papers are respectfully requested to publish the above.

In Livermore, on the 25th ult. Mrs. P. Stone, consort of Jesse Stone, Esq. aged 57. Mrs. Stone was born in Martha's Vineyard, from which place she removed to Livermore more than thirty years since. She was ever remarkably affectionate in her family, friendly and benevolent in her neighborhood and hospitable and charitable to the poor. For prudence and economy in her domestic concerns, she was excelled by none. She was ardent and constant in her friendship, and delighted in diffusing general happiness among all those with whom she was immediately connected. It might indeed be said of her as was said of Dorcas of old, "This woman was full of good works and alms-deeds which she has done." She had been a worthy member of the Baptist Church in Livermore for about twenty-eight years. Her religion was not exclusive and sectarian, but being based on the broad principles of love to God and love to man, it breathed charity and heart-felt kindness to all men. Being actuated by those ennobling principles, she ever strove to cultivate the best feelings of the human breast, and to promote the cause of rational piety, so far as her influence extended. During her last sickness which was extremely distressing, she was divinely supported by the hopes of immortality and eternal life, and entered the valley of the shadow of death, with calmness and delight. Being asked by a sister just before her dissolution, if she viewed herself near her end, and if she was ready and willing to go? She answered, 'Yes; Jesus has washed me in his own blood and prepared for me a white robe of righteousness.'

She has left a husband and five children to mourn her loss; many friends to lament her departure, and a large circle of neighbours who will long feel the irreparable loss they have sustained.

In Hallowell, on Tuesday last, Louisa Jane, child of Mr. C. Spaulding, aged 13 mos.

In Augusta, on Friday last, Mrs. Susan, consort of Mr. James Snow, aged 74. It is justice to say of the deceased, that she was a good wife, a good mother and a good neighbor. Possessing an active mind and an ardent desire to ascertain truth, she made great advances in knowledge and wisdom, and few ever conversed with her without obtaining useful information. At an early age she became convinced of the truth of the christian religion, and from that she drew unceasing sources of consolation; through every varying scene of her life she had that love of her Creator which enabled her to view death without a fear, and considered it only as a passage to heavenly felicity. She early did that work—

"*Which done, the poorest can no wants endure,*
And which, not done, the richest must be poor,"

and died, as she had lived, in full confidence of the universal benevolence of her Creator, and with universal good will to all her fellow beings.—[Augusta Pat.]

[By her life and in her death, Mrs. Snow has furnished another practical evidence that Universalism is both good to live by and good to die by.—*Ed.*]

M. B. F. O. F.

AT Masonic Hall, on Wednesday evening Feb. 13, at 6 o'clock.

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Should Clergymen be eligible to a seat in our Legislatures?

J. D. ROBINSON, Scribe.

Feb. 7.

DISTRICT OF MAINE, *SS.* Be it remembered, that on this twenty fourth day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eighhundred and twenty eight, and the fifty second year of the Independence of the United States of America, Mr. Samuel Clark, of the District of Maine, has deposited in this office, the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as Proprietor, in the words following, viz. "The American Orator. Selected chiefly from American authors; for the use of schools and private families. By Samuel Clark. Printed at the Intelligencer office, 1828."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also, to an act, entitled, "An Act supplementary to an act, entitled, an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

J. MUSSEY, *Clerk of the D. C. of Maine.*

A true copy as of record.

Attest, J. MUSSEY, *Clerk D. C. M*

KENNEBEC, ss.

To the Heirs at Law and all others interested in the Estate of Robert Porter late of Pittston, in said County, Mariner, deceased, intestate, GREETING.

WHEREAS, JOHN COLBURN, Administrator of the estate of said deceased, will settle an account of his administration upon the estate of said deceased, at a Court of Probate to be held at Hallowell, in and for said county, on the second Tuesday of February next.

YOU are hereby notified to appear at said Court and shew cause, if any you have, why said account, as exhibited, should not be allowed.

Given under my hand at Hallowell, this twenty-fifth day of January, A. D. 1828.

A. MANN, *Judge.*

POETRY.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

MR. EDITOR,---The following "Hymn" has been published, though not in the altered and improved form, in which it now appears. By inserting it, as revised by the author, Mr. E. B. Kenrick, of Newton, you will oblige me, besides presenting the public with a piece of poetry, whose only imperfection is, its brevity. R. S.

HYMN.

1.
High o'er the heaven of heavens, I saw, and trembled,
Oh God of gods! thy robes of sacred splendor!
Thunders cherubic, shouting, "Holy! holy!
LORD GOD ALMIGHTY!"

2.
Drop down, ye heavens, and pour a flood of glory---
Ye shades of death, the dawn of life approaches---
Mortals shall know the music of thy thunders,*
Infinite Goodness!

3.
Rise from the dust, array'd in godlike beauty,
Oh Solyma! immortal joys await thee--
See thy lost race, burst from their chains of darkness,
Sparkling with rapture.

4.
Nations unborn shall throng thy flaming portals,
Heaven's bright immortals, shout o'er night expiring,
And hail the morn, that lifts her smiling eyelids,
No more to slumber.

5.
Shout, ye loud winds, the universal triumph!
Sing to the world, "Thy God! thy God descendeth!
Lifts his high hand, and swears, "I live forever,
Live, thy Redeemer!"
E. B. K.

TO MY WIFE.

When the cold rains of autumn descend on the mountain,
And the husbandman's gather'd his harvest of grain;
When the sear leaves in sadness decay by the fountain,
Or are borne by the rivulet's tide through the plain;
When the robin has left its lone nest on the willow,
And no more in its innocence chirps from the tree;
O then I exclaim, as I press the lov'd pillow,
How lone I should live, if it were not for thee!

When the chill blasts of winter are heard round my dwelling,
And hurry in anger across the wild moor,
I can sympathize then in the tales they are telling,
Of distress to the aged, and grief to the poor:
And as the bright fire on the glad hearth is blazing,
And the children are prattling their accents of glee,
I cannot but think, as the tempest is raising,
How lone I should live, if it were not for thee!

Then although the wide tempest may sweep o'er the ocean,
And carry distress from the lakes to the main,
I'll calmly recline from its wildest commotion,
In my neat little cottage which stands on the plain;
And as each new year its fresh favors are giving,
May we sail down life's current from poverty free--
May we see all around us in happiness living,
Though but lone it had been if it were not for thee.

MY HUSBAND.

When various nymphs with beauty's smile,
Threw round their fascinating wile,
Thy manly bosom to beguile,
My Husband!

Then who, by love's strong pow'rs imprest,
Selected me from all the rest,
And thought me wisest, fairest best,
My Husband!

Resigning what's called liberty,
A willing captive now to be,
Who gave up all the world for me?
My Husband!

Who ploughs, perhaps, the foaming main,
Or boldly joins the warrior's train,
For me Dame Fortune's smiles to gain?
My Husband!

Who plants his groves and woodlands o'er,
Or tills the fields, or ploughs the moor,
To fill my purse with golded store?
My Husband!

Who, led by Wisdom's steady star,
Displays his talents near and far,
At church, the senate, or the bar?
My Husband!

And who, superior to pretence,
With brilliant wit and eloquence,
Delights me with his manly sense?
My Husband!

Who clasps me to his faithful breast,
And vows, that of such love possess'd,
No mortal man was e'er so blest?
My Husband.

Then let me use my utmost art,
Domestic comfort to impart,
And never pain thy constant heart,
My Husband.

O yes, with woman's softest powers,
I'll pluck the fairest, sweetest flowers,
To strew with love thy passing hours,
My Husband!

And, crown'd with peace and harmony,
Thy life so very sweet shall be,
Thou 'lt bless the day thou wedded me,
My Husband!

* But the thunder of his power, who can understand?---Job

MISCELLANEOUS.

[From the Connecticut Herald.]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS.

NO. II.

The case of a civil ruler and his subject is much like that of a father and his minor son. If the son behave himself unseemly, the father may correct him. If, after all due admonitions and corrections, the son should prove to be incorrigible, the father may expell him from his family; and he may disinherit him: but he may not kill him!—All civil governments originated in families. The father of the family had a natural right of jurisdiction over his decendants; and an acquired right, on account of the support and protection afforded them during their infancy and childhood. And, by the alliance or union of many families, it becomes national. But the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain. If no father have a right to inflict the punishment of death on his minor son for any crime, then a million of fathers would have no right by themselves or their representatives to do it. In such case, numbers, power, and substitution, considered either severally or jointly, cannot create or increase a right. And I humbly conceive, that the rightful jurisdiction of the civil magistrate over any member of the community, never can rise higher than that of a father over his son during his minority. All civil, as well as parental punishments, ought to be mild, humane, and corrective; not vindictive, inhuman, and extirpating: They ought to be merciful, not rigorous; proportionate to the crime, not excessive; and tend to the reformation of the delinquent, but not to his destruction; and should be inflicted with reluctance, love, and affection; not with passion, hardheartedness, and asperity. The highest encomium that can be bestowed on good rulers, is when we stile them "the fathers of their subjects, and the protectors of their rights." The government of states and of families, may, and ought to be, conducted on the same principles. In a well regulated family, a word of disapprobation, or only a frown from the master or mistress, will often prevent an offence, or reclaim an offender. Will any one say, there can be no well regulated families, unless a drawn sword, stained with the blood of their predecessors and cotemporaries, be continually pointed at the breast of each of their members? And among enlightened freemen, can no good civil government exist, without the infliction of inhuman and sanguinary punishments? Will not clemency, moderation, and affection—and, if necessary, confinement and human corrections, tend more to lessen the number and atrocity of crimes; and to promote the peace and safety of the community, than inhumanity and bloodshed? Certainly they will. The cords of love and duty will form a stronger union than the terrors of the sword.

The true end of all civil punishments is fourfold. 1. To make reparation to the party injured. This is commonly done by pecuniary amercements, or fines. If reparation can be made, or if correction be necessary, it ought to be done speedily. For the offender to cherish the hopes of escaping with impunity for a long time after the commission of the crime; and for the person who has been injured to suffer long delay before any compensation be made, or any punishment be inflicted, may have a bad effect on the party and on the public. A small penalty, seasonably applied, will frequently have a more salutary effect than a great one long delayed. 2. To reform the offender. 3. To deter others from committing the like crimes. 4. To promote the peace, happiness, and security of the community. The last end may be obtained by securing and confining the criminal: or by banishing and transporting him out of their jurisdiction. Subjecting him to hard labor and corporeal punishments, would deter others, and might reform him. And, in many instances, he might make reparation. Subjecting him to death, cannot reform him, nor make any reparation to the party injured. It may, in some persons, gratify a revengeful temper, which never ought to be gratified. A public execution may produce a momentary terror in the spectators, but, at the same time, it excites in them the emotions of pity, humanity, and sympathy, which incline them to take the part of the sufferer, and to blame those who inflict those suffering upon him. These emotions are excited in the breast of the best part of the spectators: and cause, even in them, a temporary disaffection to the government. If such emotions are excited in the best, what may we not expect from the worst part of the community. In large and populous cities, great outrages are often committed by the mob on such occasions. It is a general observation in London, that the frequent executions at Tyburn, have had a most pernicious effect on the morals of the people. At such times, great numbers of the most abandoned characters in that populous city, flock together, and celebrate the occasion with revelling, drunkenness, and profanity. Many persons' pockets are robbed of their money, watches, &c. within sight of the gallows. And thus the capital punishment of one crime becomes the pernicious occasion for the commission of many! It hath often been said, that "the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church." And this observation hath been verified by all the bloody persecutions that have taken place against the christian church ever since the death of Stephen, the first martyr. From all the histories of these bloody persecutions, we may learn this important and instructive lesson, that the burning of heretics increased their number; but toleration, by quenching the fire, extinguished the name. And have we not found, by long and sad experience, that the blood of criminals is the seed of criminality; and that by inflicting capital punishments for civil crimes, the depravity of mankind, instead of being cured, hath been greatly increased.

I would farther observe, that all penalties ought to be proportionate to the crime for which they are inflicted. That death is the greatest penalty—the ne plus ultra—which the civil magistrate can inflict on any human person. And it being in all cases the extreme, will admit of no degrees of comparison: and, therefore, cannot be apportioned to the various grades of civil criminality. That the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate extends only to words spoken, and overt acts, so far as they are detrimental to society; but not to the punishment of sins as such. That all penalties inflicted beyond the demerits of the crime, are excessive and unjust. And, therefore, whenever the penalty of death is inflicted for any crime beyond its demerits, it must be considered as the shedding of innocent blood!

[From the North American Review.]

JUDGE MARSHALL.

About this period, 1796, President Washington invited Mr. Marshall to accept the office of Attorney General; but he declined it, upon the ground of its interference with his lucrative practice in Virginia. He continued in the state Legislature, but did not from his other engagements, take an active part in the ordinary business. He confined his attention principally to those questions, which involved the main interests of the country, and brought into discussion the policy and the principles of the national parties.

* * * * *

The session of Congress in the winter of 1799—1800, will forever be memorable in the annals of America. Men of the highest talents and most commanding influence in the Union were there assembled, and arrayed with all the hostility of party spirit, and all the zeal of conscious responsibility, against each other. Every important measure of the administration was subjected to the most scrutinizing criticism; and was vindicated with a warmth proportionate to the ability of the attack. Mr. Marshall took an active part in the debates, and on one occasion distinguished himself in a manner, which will not easily be forgotten. * * *

In May, 1800, Mr. Marshall was, without the slightest personal communication, nominated by the President to the office of Secretary of War, upon the dismissal of Mr. M'Henry. We believe, that the first information received of it by Mr. Marshall was at the department itself, where he went to transact some business previous to his return to Virginia. He immediately wrote a letter, requesting the nomination to be withdrawn by the President. It was not, and his appointment was confirmed by the Senate. The rupture between the President and Colonel Pickering, who was then Secretary of State, soon afterwards occurred, and Mr. Marshall was appointed his successor.—This was indeed an appointment in every view most honorable to his merits, and for which he was in the highest degree qualified. Yet he had great difficulties in accepting it; and his final determination to accept it was mainly influenced by the same motive, which induced him to surrender his practice at the bar for a seat in Congress, a deep sense of public duty.—The circumstances, under which he took the office, were not without embarrassment. The late cabinet had been dissolved in a manner, which left room for the indulgence of some personal resentments, if not recriminations; and the warm attachment which Mr. Marshall at all times evinced for President Adams, would naturally excite some coolness in those, who were then alienated from him. He had, however, the satisfaction soon to find himself upon the most cordial terms with all the Cabinet, and in the full possession of the unlimited confidence of the public.

Upon the resignation of Mr. Chief Justice Ellsworth, a good deal of public anxiety was expressed respecting his successor. The friends of Mr. Justice Patterson, who was certainly an eminent Judge, indulged the hope, that he would be nominated to the office. When the President consulted the Secretary of State on this subject, the latter unhesitatingly recommended Mr. Patterson. The President, however, had an insuperable objection to the nomination, assigning as a reason, that he could not make it without wounding the feelings of Mr. Justice Cushing, who was an old friend, and the senior Judge on the bench. He nominated Mr. Jay, who declined; and as soon as that fact was known, the President, with unusual promptitude and decision, nominated Mr. Marshall.—The nomination was confirmed by the Senate, and Mr. Marshall, on the 31st day of January, 1801, became Chief Justice of the United States, and has continued ever since that period to fill the office with increasing reputation and unsullied dignity. The wisdom of this choice, whatever might have been the disappointment or partiality of the friends of other candidates, has been fully established by the event. The sagacity and independence of President Adams, that intuitive perception of character, and comprehensiveness, of observation, almost amounting to prophecy, which were so prominent traits in his mind, never were unfolded in a more imposing form. There is probably not a reflecting man in America of any party, who would not now cheerfully admit, that the highest judicial honors could not have fallen on any one, who could have sustained them with more solid advantage to the glory or interests of the country.

A physician in New-England, of a facetious disposition, who had long practised according to the customs of the day, giving and receiving wine and spirits in the social circle, became convinced of the evil of such a course about a year ago, and took the following method of arresting the influence of custom.—Having several friends at his house one day, he had decanters produced as usual, and said to the company, "Gentlemen, will you help yourselves? Here is wine, and brandy, and gin, and arsenic; all are poisons; some slower in their operations than others but equally sure; take your choice."

PROSPECTUS

OF A MONTHLY JOURNAL FOR

FARMERS & MECHANICS,

TO BE PUBLISHED IN GARDINER, ME.

And Edited by

EZEKIEL HOLMES, M. D.

Professor of Agriculture, Chemistry, and Natural History, in Gardiner Lyceum.

FARMERS & MECHANICS:---

Permit us to present to you the prospectus of a new periodical publication to be devoted to the promotion of your respective occupations and interests, entitled THE NEW-ENGLAND FARMERS' & MECHANICS' JOURNAL. We present it to you not without strong hopes that you will unite heart and hand in its support. Its objects are two fold.

1. To collect the many improvements which you may make in your several employments, to embody them, and to hand them to the world, in a permanent shape.

2. To scatter among you such facts and improvements as are or may be made in other parts of the world, and thus make the labors of others subservient to your own wants.

The advantages of such a publication, will (we trust) be obvious to every one. There is at present nothing of the kind published among us.

By a publication of this kind, difficulties might be explained,---doubts confirmed or done away,---and knowledge more extensively diffused among those who most need it. It will also be a means of social intercourse between those who are now distant strangers;---a medium, of friendly exchange of sentiment, whereby congenial minds and spirits can contribute to the wants, the pleasures and the information of each other.

The work will be published monthly, on good paper, with a fair type, and in an octavo form, and each number will contain 24 pages, a part to be devoted to mechanical subjects, a part to agricultural, and a part to miscellaneous subjects of general utility.

Each number will contain a cut or engraving of some useful machine; those recently invented will be preferred.

If any one have queries to propose,---doubts to solve,---or difficulties to be explained, we will gladly insert them for those to answer who may feel competent.

The Journal will be published at P. Sheldon's office in Gardiner, Maine, and issued at 2 dolls. 50 cts. per annum, or 2 dolls. if paid in advance, and sent to any part of the world to which the mail will convey it.

This, gentlemen, is the plan of our undertaking; shall it go into operation or not? Our object is to disseminate knowledge, let it come from what source it may, and while we shall endeavor to be honest, and give every one his due meed of credit, we shall also be assiduous in collecting and publishing whatever we think will be pleasing and instructing to our readers.

We shall therefore put in requisition every publication which we can lay hold of---Newspapers, Magazines, Pamphlets, octavo, quarto or folio must submit to a search or keep out of our way; and such part or parcel will be converted to our use as shall seem unto us good.

Any person procuring five subscribers and becoming responsible for the pay, shall receive one copy gratis

N. B. The first number of the Journal is nearly printed and will be sent to any person wishing to examine the work; and if a sufficient number of subscribers be obtained to warrant a continuance of the publication, the second will be issued in February, and one number regularly each succeeding month.

Persons obtaining signatures are requested to forward them to the editor or publisher by the firs of January next.

Gardiner, November, 1827.

BRICKS WANTED.---Proposals will be received until the 15th day of February next for the delivery at Fort Adams, Newport Harbour, R. I. of 750,000 common Bricks.

These bricks must be cast in moulds of such size as to average, when thoroughly burned, 8 inches by 4 inches by 2 1-2 inches.

They must be of the best quality of Merchantable Bricks. The proportion of salmon or pale bricks must not exceed one eighth of the whole; and no soft or very pale bricks will be received. The proportion of arch bricks must not exceed 1-8 of the whole; and none of those that are much warped will be received. The proportion of broken bricks must not exceed two per cent.

At leas 50,000 to be delivered by the 15th of May 1828, and the remainder in the course of the summer and autumn of the same year, at such periods as may best suit the convenience of the contractor---provided that there is always on hand the supply requisite for the progress of the work.

Before forming the contract, a fair sample will be required to be deposited in the Engineer office at Fort Adams, which, should it prove satisfactory, will govern in the inspection of the several deliveries.

Payments will be made, if required, on each cargo duly inspected and received. All communications touching this subject to be directed to Lt. Col. Joseph G. Totten, U. S. Eng. Newport, R. I.

Fort Adams, Dec. 10, 1827. 52

SHERIFF'S SALE. *KENNEBEC, SS.* January 12th, 1828. Taken on execution and will be sold at public auction on Saturday the sixteenth day of February next at two o'clock, P. M. at the Store of Jonathan Young in Pittston,---All the right in equity which Benjamin Pulcifer of Pittston has to redeem a lot of land lying in said Pittston, mortgaged and bounded as follows: Westerly on Eastern River, Northerly by land of John Little and Levi Moody, Easterly by land of Leonard Cooper, Southerly by land of David Blen, containing about one hundred and thirty-six acres, with the buildings thereon.

JOSEPH YOUNG, Dep'ty Sheriff. 3

BOOK AND JOB PRINTING,

EXECUTED in the neatest manner, and with despatch, at the *Intelligencer Office.*

TERMS OF THE INTELLIGENCER.

Two dollars per annum, payable on or before the commencement of each volume, or at the time of subscribing, or two dollars and fifty cents if paid within or at the close of the year; and in all cases where payment is delayed after the expiration of a year, interest will be charged.

Twenty-five cents each, will be allowed to any agent, or other person, procuring new and good subscribers; and 10 per cent will be allowed to agents on all money collected and forwarded to the publisher, free of expense, except that collected of new subscribers, for the first year's subscription.

No subscription will be discontinued, except at the discretion of the publisher, until all arrearages are paid.

All communications addressed to the editor or publisher, and forwarded by mail must be sent free of postage.